

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Formative peer assessment in healthcare education programs – protocol for a scoping review
AUTHORS	Stenberg, Marie; Mangrio, Elisabeth; Bengtsson, Mariette; Carlson, Elisabe

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Morkos Iskander Health Education North West (Mersey) UK
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>There are some minor points that may need addressing.</p> <p>I. Even if it is purely an initial starting point, it is worth stating explicitly the inclusion and exclusion criteria.</p> <p>II. In reference 14, please. Spell HEA rather than use th acronym</p> <p>III. It is difficult to accept the PRISMA algorithm for scoping reviews without further justification. I accept that it may be appropriate, but a reference is not sufficient to justify it.</p> <p>IV. With specific regard to you reference of your methodology, through reading and re-reading your discription I get the impression that you will attempt to use a variant of grounded theory. This is not an unreasonable choice for a scoping review. However, I would like to know which 'flavour' of grounded theory you will use and why you chose it. Bengtsson (2016) is a survey of different qualitative review methods rather than a recipe to follow.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Diana Wood University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine UK
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This paper describes a scoping review to be used to inform a future research study into formative peer assessment in healthcare education. The paper is clearly written and the six-stage process well defined.</p> <p>My main question relates to the decision not to apply quality criteria to the studies identified in the literature search. Using the broad methodology described, it is likely that a large number of papers will be identified, of differing quality. The rationale for including all identified papers is not obvious from the paper. Clearly it is important to extend the database to include grey literature and so forth, but why then proceed with analysis of papers of poor quality? Your goal to describe the overall landscape of knowledge related to formative</p>
-------------------------	---

	peer assessment would equally be met by a statement of the number of papers rejected on defined quality criteria. The English needs some minor attention relating to missing prepositions and conjunctions. The use of "Ibid" (p5) is not usual in Vancouver referencing.
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1	Author response	Change made to article	Page
1. Even if it is purely an initial starting point, it is worth stating explicitly the inclusion and exclusion criteria.	Thank you. We think we have stated the inclusion and exclusion criteria explicitly on p.6 and 7, however, we agree that it can be more visible.	Sub-heading with inclusion and exclusion criteria added. Changed the disposition of the text. Added additional inclusion criteria.	6
2. In reference 14, please. Spell HEA rather than use the acronym	Sorry, we have misread the reference and rephrased it accordingly.	Change made and highlighted yellow.	10
3. It is difficult to accept the PRISMA algorithm for scoping reviews without further justification. I accept that it may be appropriate, but a reference is not sufficient to justify it.	Thank you, we have tried to justify the use of the PRISMA algorithm	Clarification made and highlighted yellow.	7 and 8
4. With specific regard to you reference of your methodology, through reading and re-reading your description I get the impression that you will attempt to use a variant of grounded theory. This is not an unreasonable choice for a scoping review. However, I would like to know which 'flavour' of grounded theory you will use and why you chose it. Bengtsson (2016) is a survey of different qualitative review methods rather than a recipe to follow.	Thank you for your valuable comment. Our intention is not to use grounded theory since this is a literature based study. However, we do agree that Bengtsson (2016) is a survey of qualitative methods. Therefore, we attempt to conduct a thematic analyse and use the guidelines described by Braun and Clarke (2006).	Change made and yellow highlighted	2 and 8
Reviewer #2	Author response	Changes made to article	Page
1. Using the broad methodology described, it is likely that a large number of papers will be identified, of	Thank you for your valuable comment. A scoping review do not require assessment according to Arksey and	Change made and yellow	2,6 and 7

<p>differing quality. The rationale for including all identified papers is not obvious from the paper. Clearly it is important to extend the database to include grey literature and so forth, but why then proceed with analysis of papers of poor quality? Your goal to describe the overall landscape of knowledge related to formative peer assessment would equally be met by a statement of the number of papers rejected on defined quality criteria.</p>	<p>O'Malley (2005) or Levac (2010). However, since our questions refer to interventions of peer assessment we do agree that it is essential to conduct an evaluation of methodological quality. Therefore, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme has been added to our protocol.</p>	<p>highlighted</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The English needs some minor attention relating to missing prepositions and conjunctions.</p>	<p>We have edited the manuscript for language</p>	<p>Changes made</p>	
<p>The use of "Ibid" (p5) is not usual in Vancouver referencing.</p>	<p>Thank you, we have followed the advice and changed according to the Vancouver referencing.</p>	<p>Changes made. We deleted the "ibid" since the reference is stated in the sentence.</p>	

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Diana Wood University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine Cambridge, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Sep-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	I believe my concerns from the first draft have been addressed.